DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 437 101 JC 000 061

TITLE	Houston Community College System Institutional Effectiveness Report, 1997-98.
INSTITUTION	Houston Community Coll. System, TX.
PUB DATE	1999-03-00
NOTE	45p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Outcomes Assessment; *Community Colleges; Educational Assessment; Educational Change; Educational Development; *Educational Improvement; Educational Quality; *Institutional Evaluation; *Institutional Mission; Institutional Role; *School Effectiveness; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Houston Community College System TX

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report is to "close the loop" by providing feedback to the administration and Board regarding Houston Community College System's (HCCS) institutional effectiveness efforts for the fiscal year 1997-98. Part 1 is a status report on the institution's progress toward accomplishing its eight strategic goals as outlined in "Vision for the Future." Progress has been made on all eight goals. Most significant is the work that has been done to ensure responsive curricula and to demonstrate continuous improvement. Part 2 is a status report on the institution's performance in seven areas identified as critical to its success. Overall, HCCS's performance is satisfactory. However, there are two areas in which performance is less than satisfactory. In the area of student progress, the number of degrees and certificates awarded in 1997-98 falls below the baseline; and, in the area of cultural and cross-cultural activities, the number of international partnerships for year one remains at baseline. Part 3 is a summary of strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for improvement that emerged from the pilot program reviews conducted during the summer of 1998. Several recommendations consistently emerged from the reviews: the need to develop a purpose statement; the need to measure customer satisfaction; the need for improved classroom and lab facilities; and the need to develop and substantiate budget proposals for additional funding. (VWC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 437 101

1997-98 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REPORT

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Drain

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

HOUSTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

JC 000 601

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Houston Community College System
1997-98 Institutional Effectiveness Report

Published by the Office of Institutional Research
March 1999

Houston Community College System does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or disability.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the *1997-98 Institutional Effectiveness Report* is to "close the loop" by providing feedback to the administration and Board regarding HCCS' institutional effectiveness efforts for the fiscal year 1997-98.

Part I is a status report on the institution's progress toward accomplishing its eight strategic goals as outlined in *Vision for the Future*. Progress has been made on all eight goals. Most significant is the work that has been done to ensure responsive curricula and to demonstrate continuous improvement. Plans have been implemented to evaluate all curricula through a comprehensive program review process and to use the results of those evaluations to improve the educational program of the institution. Program evaluation is a major component of the institutional effectiveness process that is being developed and implemented across the system.

While there are numerous strategies that remain to be carried out, there are several areas for concern if HCCS is to fulfill its three-year planning goals. In establishing the objective to promote student success by increasing by 50 percent the number of certificates and degrees awarded, the institution might have been too ambitious. One-third of the time frame has elapsed and there is no increase in the number of awards. Another concern is the goal to expand community outreach. Because of the decision to delay filling the position of Executive Director of International Initiatives, there were no strategies to increase the number of international partnerships during 1997-98. Therefore, much work remains to achieve the desired 50 percent increase by year 2000.

Part II is a status report on the institution's performance in seven areas identified as critical to its success. Overall, HCCS' performance is satisfactory. However, there are two areas in which performance is less than satisfactory. In the area of student progress, the number of degrees and certificates awarded in 1997-98 falls below the baseline; and, in the area of cultural and cross-cultural activities, the number of international partnerships for year one remains at baseline.

Part III is a summary of the strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for improvement that emerged from the pilot program reviews conducted during the summer of 1998. Nine workforce development programs conducted self-studies and hosted on-site reviews by visiting teams. Several recommendations consistently emerged from the team reviews: the need to develop a purpose statement; the need to measure customer (employer and student) satisfaction; the need for improved classroom and lab facilities; and the need to develop and substantiate budget proposals for additional funding. One program was cited for exemplary status.

The eight academic programs that participated in the pilot program review encountered difficulties with the design of the pilot instrument and did not successfully complete the process. The instrument has since been revised and the eight programs were rolled over into the Fall 1998 review schedule.

The next institutional effectiveness report, 1998-99, will include several additional sections: (1) a follow-up report on the actions taken by the nine workforce programs to address the recommendations that emerged from the 1997-98 program evaluations; and, (2) a report on the 1998-99 academic program reviews.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary ii

Committees for Institutional Planning and Evaluation iv

Introduction 1

Part I. **Status Report on *Vision for the Future* at the End of Year One (1997-98)** 2

***Vision for the Future*: Strategic Plan Outcomes for Year One (1997-98)** 6

Part II. **Status Report on Critical Success Indicators and Performance Measures at the End of Year One (1997-98)** 14

Critical Success Indicators and Performance for Year One (1997-98) 16

COMMITTEES FOR INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Ruth Burgos-Sasscer	Chancellor, *Ex Officio*
Patricia C. Williamson	Vice Chancellor Institutional Development, *Chair*
Patricia Fairchild	Vice Chancellor Workforce Development
Mark Tiller	Interim Vice Chancellor Educational Development
Jim Vasquez	Chair, Information Technology Steering Committee
Charles Orsak	Chair, Institutional Effectiveness Committee

College Representatives

Zach Hodges	President, Northwest
Jackie Mullis	Administration, Northeast
Bill Askew	Faculty, Northwest
Dorothy Lewis	Faculty, Southwest
Johnella Bradford	Faculty, Southeast
Jackie Howard	Professional, Northeast
Sandra LaFever	Support Staff, Central
Martin Houg	Counselor, Central
Ray Garay	Counselor, Southeast
Dennis Klappersack	Librarian, Southwest

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE

Charles Orsak	Director Institutional Research, *Chair*
Celia Gee	Administrative Services
Fena Garza	Educational Development
Charles Hebert	Workforce Development
John Brown	Central College
Elizabeth Judge	Northeast College
Mary Alice Wills	Northwest College
Jean Vining	Southeast College
Arnold Goldberg	Southwest College

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the *1997-98 Institutional Effectiveness Report* is to "close the loop" by providing feedback to the members of the administration and the Board regarding HCCS' institutional effectiveness efforts for the fiscal year 1997-98. The Office of Institutional Research, in collaboration with the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness committees, is charged with the responsibility for reporting on institutional effectiveness activities. It is the role of the Chancellor and her council to use the information in this report as a basis for making decisions and initiating actions that will make HCCS more effective in fulfilling its mission, goals and objectives.

This report is divided into three parts. Part I summarizes the institution's progress toward accomplishing its *Vision for the Future* at the end the 1997-98 fiscal year and Part II the institution's performance in the seven critical success areas. Part III summarizes the status of the nine workforce programs that were evaluated during the Summer of 1998.

The assessments in this document were developed by Dr. Pat Williamson, Chair of the Planning Committee, and Dr. Charles Orsak, Chair of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and Institutional Research staff members. Assessments were formed by comparing data collected by the Office of Institutional Research and its liaisons for Year One with baselines established for both the planning goals/objectives and the critical success indicators/performance measures. Included with the overall assessments are two supporting documents: "AVision for the Future: Strategic Plan Outcomes for Year One (1997-98)" and "Critical Success Indicators and Performance for Year One (1997-98)." The strategic planning document provides objectives for accomplishing the established goals; the performance measures document identifies seven indicators or areas of inquiry deemed critical to measuring the institution's success in fulfilling its mission and goals. Both documents include all baselines and Year One data. These data report the degree of effectiveness with which HCCS achieves its goals and fulfills its mission, and will provide the basis for constructing the next three-year strategic plan which will begin in 2001.

PART I.
STATUS REPORT ON *VISION FOR THE FUTURE* AT THE END OF YEAR ONE (1997-98)

During 1996-97, the Chancellor and the Chancellor's Council developed its *Vision for the Future*, establishing eight strategic goals to focus the institution's efforts over the course of the succeeding three years. Objectives for accomplishing these goals ***by 2000*** were also established.

This part of the *Institutional Effectiveness Report* is an assessment of the outcomes of Year One planning and a summary of HCCS' progress in accomplishing its *Vision for the Future* goals and objectives from September 1997 through August 1998.

Goal 1. Promote Student Success—***By 2000, the institution will increase the number of certificates and degrees by 50%, meet or exceed the state community college average for university transfer and job placement rates, and establish a counselor/student ratio of 1/1,200.***

Overall Status of Goal 1: Numerous strategies have been developed to guide efforts for increasing the number of certificates and degrees awarded. Although there was no increase in the number of awards for 1997-98, the actions planned for 1998-99 should produce more positive results. The institution is less than 0.1 percent of meeting the average transfer rate for the state and exceeds the state average for job placement by 2.2 percent.

Goal 2. Improve Student Access—***By 2000, the institution will increase by 25% the number of students enrolled in nontraditional format courses, increase annually by 10% the number of GED graduates who enroll in credit courses at HCCS the following year, enroll a percentage of ethnic minority students to equal or exceed the percentage in the service area; and, in its staffing, the institution will reflect the demographics of the Houston community.***

Overall Status of Goal 2: Efforts directed towards Objective 2.1 of this goal resulted in only a 1 percent increase in students enrolled in nontraditional formats for 1997-98, leaving much work to be done in the remaining two years of this planning cycle to reach a 25 percent increase. In regard to increasing the enrollment of students with GEDs as stated in Objective 2.2, HCCS should reconsider establishing of meaningful objectives and baseline data, because HCCS does not produce GED graduates but prepares students for GED testing. Most students in GED classes are there for job-related reasons. Students without a high school diploma and who wish to attend college may register in HCCS' credit developmental program. It may be more meaningful to measure the number of HCCS credit students who enter with a GED regardless of when the GED was achieved.

The last two objectives for improving student access focus on HCCS' success in reflecting the ethnic make-up of its service area. In comparing the outcomes of Year One with established baselines, HCCS' enrollment continues to exceed the percentage of African-Americans and Asians in the service area and shows a 0.7 percent growth in Hispanic enrollment. The demographics for the Houston community are closely reflected in HCCS' body of employees with one notable exception: the percentage of Hispanic faculty is 18 percent below the population percentage. Overall, the strategies for improving student access seem to be well planned and should continue to yield positive results.

Goal 3. Ensure Responsive Curricula—***By 2000, the institution will increase customized training by 50%, implement four new programs to meet workforce needs while eliminating four that are no longer viable, and implement a plan to periodically evaluate the curricula for all its educational programs.***

Overall Status of Goal 3: HCCS has made a significant start toward accomplishing its goal to ensure responsive curricula. The number of customized training contracts has increased by 88 percent over the baseline, which well exceeds the goal set for year 2000. Three new technical programs have been implemented and a fourth is scheduled for 1998-99. While only one program has been eliminated thus far, it is anticipated that the newly implemented program review process will help to identify those programs that no longer meet workforce needs. Therefore, through restructuring of the discipline committees, establishing comprehensive program reviews, and initiating an evaluation of developmental studies, HCCS is well on its way to ensuring a curricula that is responsive to both student and business/industry needs.

Goal 4. **Build New and Varied Partnerships—*By 2000, each college within the institution will develop a relationship with each high school and middle school in its service region and establish a minimum of one partnership with a local library. One hundred students will participate in American Reads due to institutional support of this literacy program. The institution will increase by 25% the number of business/industry partners who provide cooperative education experiences for workforce students and increase by 20% its agreements with four-year institutions.***

Overall Status of Goal 4: Reasonable progress has been made in enhancing educational opportunities at HCCS through expanding the institution's relationships with external constituencies. Overall, the total number of relationships between the colleges and service area schools has increased. However, baseline data does not establish the number of possible relationships within each college's service area. This information needs to be included in the base and updated annually in order to assess outcomes in year 2000. The objective for establishing local library relationships proved unnecessary, since all colleges have at least one such relationship. Thus, the value of establishing data for future planning is recognized. At the end of Year One, HCCS has already reached 63 percent of its goal with America Reads, and has met the desired increase in agreements with higher institutions. The colleges need to remain focused on efforts for increasing cooperative education opportunities with business/industry by designating responsibility for site-based education and co-op programs as planned.

Goal 5. **Strengthen Institutional Resources—*By 2000, the institution will implement a Ten-Year Facilities Plan; complete extensions at Stafford, Eastside, and the initial building of Northeast Campus, and a Health Careers Center; and provide comprehensive library resources at each college. In addition, full-time faculty will teach 50% of HCCS' credit classes. Funds generated through scholarships and grants and other contributions will increase by 10%, and the HCCS Foundation will become financially self-sufficient.***

Overall Status of Goal 5: Six objectives have been established for this three-year strategic planning period to achieve greater operational efficiency and effectiveness, and baselines have been established where appropriate. A Master Facilities Plan is under development, and plans to get out of HISD and leased facilities and consolidate and purchase sites are progressing well. The Stafford extension was completed in 1997-98, and the construction of the new Northeast complex, the Health Careers Center and the Eastside expansion is underway and on target for completion by Fall 1999. Likewise, plans for expanding library resources are progressing, as evidenced by completion of phase one of the automation project and the expansion of facilities that is underway in all colleges.

Faculty resources have been strengthened by 60 additional full-time faculty in 1997-98. The Chancellor's Executive Team has given priority status to faculty hiring for the next two years (1998-99, 1999-2000). Activities to increase Federal, state, and other grant funding

resulted in an 8.5 percent increase over the baseline amount. The HCCS Foundation has increased the amount of funds generated by 74 percent over the baseline, so significant progress has been made in becoming financially self-sufficient.

Goal 6. **Increase Technological Capability**—***By 2000, the institution will implement its strategic plan for technology, complete its data network infrastructure at all permanent locations and provide open access computers at each college for faculty and student use during college service hours.***

Overall Status of Goal 6: With the exception of the number of open access computers per college, no baselines were needed for this goal. Strategies for accomplishing this goal appear to be well thought out, and considerable progress was made during Year One. The institution has developed a three-year operational plan for technology and completed other technological activities targeted for 1997-98. The number of open access computers has increased throughout the system; the focus is on increasing the available open lab hours.

Goal 7. **Expand Community Outreach**—***By 2000, the institution will conduct a workforce needs assessment in all areas where new facilities are planned, create and disseminate an HCCS experts list to the community, and increase by 50% the number of international partnerships.***

Overall Status of Goal 7: Several needs assessments were conducted in 1997-98; however, most of the activities toward fulfilling this goal are scheduled for Year Two and Year Three. The number of international partnerships reported for Year One is static based on the baseline established in 1996-97, largely because the System has delayed filling the position responsible for this objective.

Goal 8. **Demonstrate Continuous Improvement**—***By 2000, the institution's full-time employees will participate in at least three job-related professional development activities per year to include technological training. The institution will provide opportunities for professional development for part-time personnel. In addition, the institution will develop and implement an institutional effectiveness plan and use the results for institutional improvement, and also implement recommendations from the Workforce Focus Group for improving technical education programs.***

Overall Status of Goal 8: No baseline data were required for the three objectives the institution established for this goal. However, the number of full-time employees per year versus the number participating in three professional development activities per year will need to be documented to demonstrate achievement of this goal by year 2000. Forms for reporting have been included in the employee performance evaluations. Similarly, opportunities for part-time personnel will need to be documented.

The institution is well on its way to implementing an institutional effectiveness plan that should provide positive results. During 1997-98, representatives from all levels of the institution evaluated progress toward achievement of the 1997-2000 goals and objectives and provided input by reviewing the strategic plan and revising or writing new strategies as needed. A system-level Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Committee was appointed and the directive was issued to form college-level committees. The IE Committee finalized the institutional-level performance measures, and the Office of Institutional Research established the necessary baselines. The IE plan was presented to the Chancellor's Council, all the colleges and system administrative units. The plan requires that all units across the system develop purpose statements, goals, objectives and performance measures. This activity is in progress and the initial development stage is near completion. In support of institutional planning and evaluation activities, the Office of

Institutional Research has provided general assistance and training and collected and distributed substantial statistical data. Recommendations from the Workforce Focus Group for improving technical programs were incorporated into the Workforce Development Program Review instrument, which was piloted in Summer 1998.

In summary, the institution has made substantial progress in developing and implementing the framework for a plan to assess institutional effectiveness. Procedures to ensure use of results for institutional improvement must be established as the plan develops. An annual assessment of institutional effectiveness activities, such as this report, will provide valuable information for planning and budgetary decision making.

Houston Community College System

A Vision for the Future

Strategic Plan Outcomes for Year One (1997-98)

GOAL 1. PROMOTE STUDENT SUCCESS

3-Year Objectives

Objective 1.1 The number of certificates & degrees awarded will increase by 50%.			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
1,086 Degrees 1,102 Certificates 2,188 Total Awards	1,040 Degrees 1,096 Certificates 2,136 Total Awards		
Objective 1.2a Transfer rates will meet or exceed the state community college average.			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
HCCS 25.8% State Avg 27.7%	HCCS 28.1% State Avg 28.2%		
Objective 1.2b Job placement rates will meet or exceed the state community college average.			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
HCCS 85.00% State Avg 79.72%	HCCS 85.4% State Avg 83.2%		
Objective 1.3 The ratio of full-time counselors to students will be 1/1,200.			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Counselor/Student Ratio=1/1,204	Counselor/Student Ratio=1/1,173		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GOAL 2. IMPROVE STUDENT ACCESS

3-Year Objectives

Objective 2.1 Increase by 25% the number of students enrolled in courses offered in nontraditional formats (i.e. distance learning, flex entry, weekends).

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Distance Education= 6,163 Flex Entry= 24,375 Weekends= 10,621	Distance Education= 7,303 Flex Entry= 22,319 Weekends= 12,113		

Objective 2.2 Increase annually by 10% the number of HCCS G.E.D. graduates who enroll the following year in HCCS credit courses.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Fall '97 = 125 students from HCCS classes (out of 4,576)	Fall '98 = 94 students from HCCS classes (out of 4,120)		

Objective 2.3 The percentage of ethnic minority students enrolled in credit courses will equal or exceed the percentage in the service area population at large.

Baseline Data 1996-97

	W	B	H	A	O
Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%	
HCCS	39.8%	22.7%	22.5%	14.1%	0.8%

Outcomes Year One 1997-98

	W	B	H	A	O
Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%	
HCCS	38.8%	23.0%	23.2%	13.8%	1.2%

Outcomes Year Two 1998-99

Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000

Objective 2.4 The demographics of faculty, staff and administrators will reflect the demographics of the Houston community.

Baseline Data 1996-97

	W	B	H	A	O
Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%	

	W	B	H	A/O
Faculty	63.4%	22.2%	7.7%	6.8%
Admin.	56.7%	22.5%	18.3%	2.5%
Staff	36.5%	35.8%	21.0%	6.7%

Outcomes Year One 1997-98

	W	B	H	A	O
Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%	

	W	B	H	A/O
Faculty	63.2%	22.1%	7.8%	7.0%
Admin.	55.2%	21.9%	20.0%	2.9%
Staff	34.7%	35.3%	23.4%	6.6%

Outcomes Year Two 1998-99

Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GOAL 3. ENSURE RESPONSIVE CURRICULA

3 YEAR OBJECTIVES

Baseline Data 1996-97	Outcomes Year One 1997-98	Outcomes Year Two 1998-99	Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000
Objective 3.1 Increase by 50% the number of customized training contracts.			
Customized Training Contracts=95	Customized Training Contracts=179		
Objective 3.2 Develop and implement four (4) new technical programs that meet regional workforce needs.			
No Baseline Data Needed	Programs Implemented=3		
Objective 3.3 Eliminate four (4) programs that no longer meet regional workforce needs.			
No Baseline Data Needed	One Eliminated=Uphostery		
Objective 3.4 Develop and implement a plan to periodically evaluate all curricula.			
No Baseline Data Needed	**Pilot Program Reviews** 9 Workforce Programs Evaluated 8 Academic DisciplinesParticipated in Pilot (Evaluation Incomplete)		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GOAL 4. BUILD NEW AND VARIED PARTNERSHIPS

3 YEAR OBJECTIVES

Objective 4.2 One hundred (100) students will participate in "America Reads" literacy program.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
# Relationships / Dual Enrollment **CEN** 4 / 0 **SE** 12 / 62 **SW** 27 / 86 **NE** 4 / 87 **NW** 13 (all HS, no MS) / 1,276 **Tech Prep Partnerships=50**	**# Relationships / Dual Enrollment** **CEN** 5 / 0 **SE** 12 / 0 **SW** 27 / 64 **NE** 17 / 136 **NW** 15 / 1,548 **Tech Prep Partnerships=54**		

Objective 4.1 Each college will develop a relationship with each high school and middle school in its service region.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	63 Students		

Objective 4.3 Increase by 25% the number of business/industry partners who will provide cooperative education opportunities for our students.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
437 Sites	475 Sites		

Objective 4.4 Each college will establish a minimum of one (1) partnership with a local library to enhance resources for its students.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	All Colleges Meet Minimum.		

Objective 4.5 Increase by 20% agreements with four-year institutions.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Agreements with 4-Year Institutions=23	Agreements with 4-Year Institutions=29		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GOAL 5. STRENGTHEN INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES

3 YEAR OBJECTIVES

Objective 5.1 The Career Health Center, the Northeast Campus and the Eastside Campus and Stafford extensions will be completed and operational.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	Stafford Extension Completed		

Objective 5.2 A Ten-Year Facilities Plan will be implemented which focuses on consolidating and purchasing operational sites for greater cost efficiency and instructional effectiveness.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	In Progress		

Objective 5.3 Each college will provide comprehensive library and learning resources.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	In Progress		

Objective 5.4 Full-time faculty will teach 50% of credit classes.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Contact Hours taught by FT Faculty=46.3%	Hours taught by FT Faculty=46.6%		

Objective 5.5 The HCCS Foundation will become financially self-sufficient.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
1996-97 Budget=$102,220 1996-97 Funds Generated=$186,585	1997-98 Budget=$102,220 1997-98 Funds Generated=$325,138		

Objective 5.6 Increase by 10% funding and other contributions from public and private sources.

Baseline Data 1996-97		*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*		*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Federal grants	$7,262,670	Federal grants	$7,728,292		
State grants	1,066,862	State grants	1,564,312		
Other grants	567,582	Other grants	366,462		
	$8,897,114		$9,659,066		
Foundation	186,585	Foundation	325,138		
Total	$9,083,699	Total	$9,984,204		

20
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GOAL 6. INCREASE TECHNOLOGICAL CAPABILITY

3 YEAR OBJECTIVES

Objective 6.1 The Strategic Plan for Technology will be updated and implemented according to schedule.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	In Progress		

Objective 6.2 The data network infrastructure to support information and instructional technologies will be completed at all permanent locations.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	In Progress		

Objective 6.3 Open access computers will be available at each college for faculty, staff, and students during college service hours.

Baseline Data 1996-97		*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*		*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
College	**# Computers**	**College**	**# Computers**		
CEN	69	CEN	98		
NE	99	NE	99		
NW	89	NW	120		
SE	156	SE	156		
SW	63	SW	75		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GOAL 7. EXPAND COMMUNITY OUTREACH

3 YEAR OBJECTIVES

Objective 7.1 Conduct an assessment of education and workforce training needs in all areas where new facilities are planned.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	Two Assessments Completed		

Objective 7.2 Create an HCCS Experts List and disseminate it to community groups.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	No Year One Data Needed		

Objective 7.3 Increase by 50% the number of international partnerships.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Total Partnerships= 19	Total Partnerships= 19		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GOAL 8. DEMONSTRATE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

3 YEAR OBJECTIVES

Objective 8.1 Full-time employees will participate in at least three (3) job related professional development activities per year to include technological training.			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	Data Not Yet Available		
Objective 8.2 The system will provide professional development opportunities for part-time employees and adjunct faculty.			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	No Year One Data Needed		
Objective 8.3 Develop and implement an institutional effectiveness plan and use the results for institutional improvement.			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	In Progress		
Objective 8.4 Implement recommendations from the Workforce Focus Group for improving technical education programs.			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	In Progress		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART II.
STATUS REPORT ON CRITICAL SUCCESS INDICATORS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES AT THE END OF YEAR ONE (1997-98)

HCCS has identified seven indicators or areas of inquiry that are critical to the institution in measuring its effectiveness in fulfilling its mission and goals. Performance measures have been established for each critical area. Also, the institution has identified existing tools for measurement and is developing new tools where needed.

The following is a summary of HCCS' performance in the seven critical success areas for fiscal year 1997-1998.

Access and Equity—*Overall performance "Satisfactory"*

Data show a decrease in total enrollment of 1 percent from the baseline, which is not a significant difference. There is a slight increase (<1%) in 1997-98 in the percentage of minority students enrolled and the percentages of those who are economically and academically disadvantaged.

Student Progress/Student Satisfaction—*Overall performance "Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory"*

According to the measures and baselines established for measuring student progress, Year One performance falls slightly behind on all the baseline measures except Fall to Spring retention. The level of student satisfaction with the overall quality of education was measured at 64 percent rating HCCS above average. The Student Survey for Spring 1998 was used as the measurement tool.

Workforce Programs—*Overall performance "Satisfactory Where Measurable"*

HCCS continues to rank above the state average in job placement for workforce program graduates. However, there is no procedure in place to effectively measure employer and graduate satisfaction with the workforce training/job preparation provided by HCCS. The Office of Institutional Research is currently spearheading efforts to develop and implement employer and graduate surveys, and expects to have data for Year Two. Performance on licensure exam pass rates is a difficult outcome to measure. Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) data are currently the only data available; however, THECB is dependent on licensing agency reports, which are not consistently available from these agencies. These data should be augmented by HCCS programs.

University Transfer—*Overall performance "Satisfactory Where Measurable"*

When establishing measures concerning university transfer, the institution did not realize the difficulty in obtaining data from selected institutions for measurement of the GPAs of HCCS transfer students versus the GPAs of native students at those selected institutions. The HCCS Transfer Office is continuing to work on this issue with HCCS' top transfer institutions (UT, UH, TX A&M). However, when HCCS transfer student GPAs are compared to all transfers for a sample of large, medium, and local institutions, HCCS student GPAs compare favorably. The total number of HCCS students transferring to universities in 1997-98 increased approximately 3 percent over the baseline. The Registrar's Office and the Office of Institutional Research are finalizing a survey to measure graduates' satisfaction with academic preparation, which students will be required to complete when they file for graduation.

Economic Development and Lifelong Learning—*Overall performance "Satisfactory"*

Baselines have been established for all four measures of this indicator, and in three out of four of those measures, Year One data show satisfactory performance in economic development and lifelong learning activities. However, there are several areas for concern.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In measuring annual enrollment in ABE, GED, ESL, and workplace literacy programs, enrollees in community-based organizations (CBOs) were included in baseline and Year One figures. To ensure consistency in data, other enrollment figures that include these literacy programs need to be examined to determine if CBO enrollments are included. A second concern is measuring the number of companies and number of individuals served by industry contract training. At present, there is no tool in place for measuring the number of individuals served in contract training unless they are individually registered, and the reliability of the present system used for tracking companies served is inadequate.

Cultural and Cross-Cultural Activities—*Overall performance "Unsatisfactory"*

The number of international partnerships reported for Year One is static based on the baseline established in 1996-97. Since the institution expects to increase such partnerships by 50 percent by year 2000, the level of performance needs to be raised. Another concern in cultural and cross-cultural activities is the tool used for counting activities sponsored by the colleges. Although the Year One number increased 48 percent over baseline, the Office of Institutional Research has some concern about consistency among the colleges on both "how they identify" and "how they count" those activities. A better process and measuring tool need to be developed for this purpose.

Institutional Support—*Overall performance "Satisfactory"*

THECB definition: Institutional support includes cost associated with executive management, fiscal operations, general administration and logistical services, administrative computing support, and public relations/development as defined by the National Association of College and University Business Officers.

The institution is performing well in the area of institutional support as evidenced by comparison of Year One data with the established baselines. The percent of contact hours taught by full-time faculty should reach the expected goal of 50 percent by year 2000. There is no significant change in the percentage of expenditures for institutional support versus total fund expenditures. Restricted funds increased slightly over baseline.

Houston Community College System

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS—INSTITUTION-LEVEL

Critical Success Indicators and Performance for Year One (1997-98)

INDICATOR A. ACCESS AND EQUITY

Measure A.1 HCCS credit and noncredit Fall enrollment

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Semester Hour Credit=38,362 Continuing Ed & Noncredit=15,355	Semester Hour Credit=38,204 Continuing Ed & Noncredit=14,991		

Measure A.2a Student Fall population mix compared to service area population

Baseline Data 1996-97	W	B	H	A	N Am	O
Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
HCCS Student Pop Mix	39.8%	22.7%	22.5%	14.1%	0.3%	0.5%

Year One 1997-98	W	B	H	A	N Am	O
Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
HCCS Student Pop Mix	38.8%	23.0%	23.2%	13.8%	0.3%	0.9%

Year Two 1998-99

Year Three 1999-2000

Measure A.2b Percentage of minority students (African-American, Hispanics, Native American)*

Baseline Data 1996-97	B	H	N Am.
HCCS Minority Students*	24.4%	20.7%	0.3%

(THECB Data)

Year One 1997-98	B	H	N Am.
HCCS Minority Students*	23.0%	22.7%	0.3%

(HCCS Estimated)

Year Two 1998-99

Year Three 1999-2000

Measure A.3 Faculty-staff-administration Fall population mix vs. student population mix

Baseline Data 1996-97	W	B	H	A/O
Faculty	372/63.4%	130/22.2%	45/7.7%	40/6.8%
Admin	68/56.7%	27/22.5%	22/18.3%	3/2.5%
Staff	207/36.5%	203/35.8%	119/21.0%	38/6.7%
Student Pop	39.8%	22.7%	22.5%	14.9%

Year One 1997-98	W	B	H	A/O
Faculty	381/63.2%	133/22.1%	47/7.8%	42/7%
Admin	58/55.2%	23/21.9%	21/20.0%	3/2.9%
Staff	261/34.7%	266/35.3%	176/23.4%	50/6.6%
Student Pop	38.8%	23.0%	23.2%	15.0%

Year Two 1998-99

Year Three 1999-2000

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Measure A.4 Number students receiving financial aid and schlorships			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
20,378	20,978		

Measure A.5 Percentage of students who are economically disadvantaged*			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
27.6% (THECB Data)	28% (HCCS Estimated)		

Measure A.6 Percentage of students who are academically disadvantaged*			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
34.6% (THECB Data)	35% (HCCS Estimated)		

Measure A.7 Percentage of students who are self-declared ADA			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
6% (THECB Data)	6% (HCCS Estimated)		

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INDICATOR B. STUDENT PROGRESS/STUDENT SATISFACTION

Measure B.1 Percentage of remedial students (tested and untested) who pass TASP (all three sections)*

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
HCCS=12.87% Statewide Average=15.57% (THECB Data)	HCCS=12.5% (HCCS Estimated)		

Measure B.2 Percentage of Fall semester course completers*

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
77.39% (THECB Data)	77.01% (THECB Data)		

Measure B.3 First time Fall semester students who return for Spring semester

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
6,997 (57.3%)	6,768 (58.3%)		

Measure B.4 Associate degrees and certificates awarded*

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
1,086 Degrees 1,102 Certificates 2,188 Total Awards (IPEDS Data)	1,040 Degrees 1,096 Certificates 2,136 Total Awards (HCCS Data Tentative)		

Measure B.5 Student evaluation of overall quality of education

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
None	Above average=64.8%		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

INDICATOR C. WORKFORCE PROGRAMS

Measure C.1 Job placement of graduates/program completers			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
HCCS 85.00% State Avg. 79.72%	HCCS 85.4% State Avg. 83.2%		
Measure C.2 Employers' satisfaction with competence of program completers			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
None	In Progress		
Measure C.3 Program completers' satisfaction with education preparation			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
None	In Progress		
Measure C.4 Licensure exam pass rates*			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Cosmetology=79% Law Enforcement (Academy)=76% Interpreter for the Deaf=100% Physical Therapy Assistant=71% Nurse, Registered=88% Nurse, Licensed Vocational=79% Nurse Aide=100% Court Reporting=32% (THECB Data)	Cosmetology=76% Law Enforcement (Academy)=54% Fire Protection=96% Interpreter for the Deaf=n/a Physical Therapy Assistant=66% Nurse, Registered=86% Nurse, Licensed Vocational=86% Nurse Aide=97% Court Reporting=21% (THECB Data)		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

INDICATOR D. UNIVERSITY TRANSFER

Measure D.1 Number of students who transfer to senior institutions*

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
7,406 Students (THECB Data)	7,607 Students (THECB Data)		

Measure D.2 Grade point averages of students who transfer vs. grade point average of noncommunity college (native) students at selected institutions

Baseline Data 1996-97

Type Transfer Institution	HCCS Transfers	All Transfers
Large	2.84 GPA	2.80 GPA
Medium	2.42 GPA	2.44 GPA
Local	3.01 GPA	3.07 GPA

Year One 1997-98

Type Transfer Institution	HCCS Transfers	All Transfers
Large	2.80 GPA	2.80 GPA
Medium	2.29 GPA	2.46 GPA
Local	3.01 GPA	3.07 GPA

Year Two 1998-99

Year Three 1999-2000

Measure D.3 Graduates' satisfaction with academic preparation

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
None	In Progress		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

INDICATOR E. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LIFELONG LEARNING

Measure E.1 Enrollment in ABE, GED, ESL, workplace literacy			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Total annual enrollees=19,481 (includes CBOs (Community Based Organization)	Total annual enrollees=20,362 (includes CBOs (Community Based Organization)		
Measure E.2 Number of companies and number of individuals served by industry contract training			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Number industry training contracts=95	Number industry training contracts=179		
Measure E.3 Completion of noncredit courses for personal interest			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Noncredit enrollment=17,826	Noncredit enrollment=17,210		
Measure E.4 Successful completion of Workforce CEU courses			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Course completers=22,020	Course completers=22,815		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

INDICATOR F. CULTURAL AND CROSS-CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Measure F.1 Number of international education partnerships			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Total Partnerships= 19	Total Partnerships= 19		

Measure F.2 Cultural and cross-cultural activities sponsored by the college for students, faculty, staff and community			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
143 activites	213 activities		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

INDICATOR G. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

Measure G.1 Leased/owned space per FTE

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Leased=28.55 sq ft per FTE Owned=46.32 sq ft per FTE (HCCS Data)	Leased=27.51 sq ft per FTE Owned=47.07 sq ft per FTE (HCCS Data)		

Measure G.2 Percent of contact hours taught by full-time vs. part-time faculty*

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Contact hrs taught by ft faculty=46.3% (HCCS Data)	Contact hrs taught by ft faculty=46.6% (HCCS Data)		

Measure G.3 Total amount of restricted funds

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Total restricted funds=$31,760,789 (HCCS Data)	Total restricted funds=$33,904,684 (HCCS Data)		

Measure G.4 HCCS expenditure per FTE student

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
$6,040	$6,737		

Measure G.5 Percentage of expenditures for institutional support versus total current funds expenditures*

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
9.27% (HCCS Data)	10.6% (HCCS Estimated)		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**